

**General Plan 2020 Steering Committee Meeting
October 6, 2001 – Minutes**

Attendees:

Margarette Morgan	Bonsall
Chuck Davis	Bonsall
Richard Whitaker	Boulevard
Tim McMaster	Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills
John Elliott	Descanso
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Janice Grace	Jamul/Dulzura
Gene Helsel	Julian
Randy Lenac	Lake Morena/Campo
Gordon Shackelford	Lakeside
Joe Chisolm	Pala/Pauma
Bill Huskey	Pine Valley
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Larry Aguilar	Spring Valley
John Hammond	Sweetwater
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Larry Glavinic	Valley Center
Sandy Smith	Valley Center

Visitors:

Charlene Ayers	
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Larry Paris	Rancho Santa Fe Assn.
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Joan Kearney	Ramona
Richard Hensle	Lakeside
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Jan Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Hank Palmer	Twin Oaks
Lisa Haws	Viejas Enterprises

Planning Commissioners:

Bryan Woods

Staff:

Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Jennifer Bruin (DPLU)
Karen Scarborough
Neal LaMontagne (DPLU)
Marette Esperance (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)

First Agenda Item: Steering Committee Milestones

N. LaMontagne presented summary of Steering Committee milestones and a brief history of the General Plan update process beginning in 1998. Also gave a brief statement on what is left for the Steering Committee to accomplish.

G. Shackelford: inquired about the other remaining tasks. Was concerned that the list presumed the group was supportive of TDRs and PDRs.

B. Woods: Gordon is correct – we have not made a decision, only an investigation.

M. Morgan: Have we heard anything from the consultants?

G. Pryor: County has brought in an expert, but it is still in the investigating stage. A Land Use distribution map was needed before starting to seriously look at TDR/PDR programs.

D. van Dierendonck: TDRs/PDRs are still a tool laying in the box.

Bryan Woods: TDRs/PDRs still a tool but the Land Use Distribution Map is going to be the biggest issue for the group to deal with – why we have to clean up all the other issues to get to that point. Rick Preutz is still on board though.

Second Agenda Item: Presentation on Regional Categories

M. Esperance introduced the regional land use elements that she uses everyday in the Current Planning Department. She gave an overview of the 8 regional categories and the 6 land use designations and how they are applied within the county's unincorporated areas.

L. Jones: what happens with the history of project? There are reasons why there may be a designation, yet there is no history to make a decision.

M. Esperance responds that there is a hierarchy of planning tools, zoning and variances as examples. There are some projects that do not rely heavily on the General Plan (i.e. variances). Other project decisions do rely heavily on the General Plan. Sometimes the history is lost, but community groups help keep history and understanding of intent.

J. Phillips: the issue of history is right on: in Valle de Oro and other urban fringe areas, expansion of facilities such as sewer have been through environmental analyses that have put conditions on these expansions (i.e. no sewer beyond the urban limit line). If we change the names of these categories, what happens to the mitigations called for in the EIR?

G. Shackelford: Jack is referring to Board Policy I-106. In Lakeside it is I-107. This is significant, because if you think through the GP2020 process, things like the CWA line is often mentioned but the urban limit line is rarely mentioned or not defined. The line is used to restrict sewer service expansion and therefore to contain sprawl. Urges caution in revising the regional categories.

B. Woods: one of the things which won't come on the table is changing that urban limit line and drawing that bright line around each country town to limit sewer extension. Those are two tools that are paramount in our 2020 planning to preserve our communities.

J. Phillips: Concern that the tools have been used as mitigation. The County may not have the legal right to do anything which may abrogate that mitigation.

G. Pryor: Jack is right –cannot undermine a mitigation. Can change the category but must still must respect the limitation that is there. Can't lost the protection factor.

L. Jones: corporate history is important and needs to be integrated into our process, for example, the Urban Limit Line.

G. Pryor: if we are looking at constraining sewer – which is a controlling factor in growth - in the past the utilities have been extended and growth follows, what we are now talking about at is predetermining where the growth goes and then determining where we want the sanitary sewer. At that point, we as a County must work with the utility districts to make sure their lines and systems can support the growth. If they do not choose to follow our general plan, we have the ability to determine the density and even if sewer is available, we can control who can hook up.

T. McMaster: on the Regional Land Use Element: it doesn't give any history on what was there before. Is worried about what is going to happen in the future when the regional categories are changed. Needs to be someway to keep some history – to be able to explain why some properties have certain conditions and some do not.

G. Hammers: concerned the focus has changed. Instead of planning for growth, group is planning on how to keep it from happening. End result will be continuing lack of infrastructure but still continued growth.

J. Phillips: the way the Urban Limit Line has been “leap frogged” in the past is that developers have come into fringe areas on the other side of the Limit Line and proposed clustering. The small lots won't work with septic and sewer is required - leading to gradual sprawl. The Urban Limit Line is very important in Valle de Oro.

B. Woods: our goal today is to establish parameters that will not allow that.

L. Aguilar: on the original question of history: who saves the history of projects.

M. Esperance: DPLU keeps all records in the file room, they are public records. Personal notes are not kept but the factual history are kept in the project files.

G. Pryor: there is a lot of corporate memory as to why something was put into place and that may not be in the record. It is important and that is where we need the group's input.

I. Holler and G. Pryor present the regional categories drafted by staff. I. Holler insists that these are draft categories and are not final. Option #1 is described as staff's preliminary recommendation on proposed categories. The preliminary categories came from some basic principles that the Interest Group agreed upon as well as staff's attempt at simplifying.

G. Shackelford: the Village Limit Line is a direction we want to go – should be linked to Urban Limit Line. On the Village Core and Village area – in communities which are largely built out, concern is that these categories will encourage infill development inconsistent with the established character of these areas.

On the Semi-Rural Estates, not quite clear how would you discourage its expansion.

I. Holler & G. Pryor: may end up with two lines: one on the interior (would line up with Country Towns and service boundaries) and another around the yellow (semi-rural) which would control the expansion of the semi-rural area, so the rural areas do not get converted into the estate residential densities of the semi-rural category.

G. Shackford: What we need is to amend the text to read “discourage expansion of semi-rural regional category”.

D. van Dierendonck: agrees with Gordon and encourages a motion on those items.

L. Jones: Committee has requested a “Rural Residential” category, should be incorporated in the Regional Categories.

J. Grace: Densities proposed in the preliminary definitions is a concern to Jamul/Dulzura. We have a very small town without services we want to retain that. Would the categories mean we would have to designate the entire Jamul/Dulzura plan area as Semi-Rural or Rural with no village to keep infrastructure and the higher densities out? These categories do not apply to our town center.

B. Woods: Agrees – in Bonsall, for example, they do not want a village core either.

J. Grace: We have a small village core, want to keep the commercial limited there and do not want sewers. Concern that village core categories would be applied and planning group does not want the associated densities.

B. Woods: Communities get to choose whether they have particular categories applied to their areas. Also, communities can define their ‘development area’ – surrounding the semi-rural area with a limit line to prevent sprawl.

J. Grace: that line should be as important as the Village Limit Line.

G. Hammers: the wishes of property owners are being lost and decisions about the village core, high-density area are being made by developers and environmentalists, without considering the property owners. Potrero, east of the CWA, needs a village core but without the densities prescribed in the categories. What the backcountry wants is being cast away in favor of an

ideological utopia which does not and will not exist. Property owners must be involved in creation of these concepts.

R. Whitaker: Supervisor Jacobs allowed us to retain the Alt. III map, none of these categories applies to Boulevard and how they see their map.

B. Woods: suggests that there may be a need for another category to address the desire for a rural village with lower density residential.

J. Phillips: like the existing Country Town category!

L. Jones: the range that is given for the Village Category – can not the individual communities set their own densities?

B. Woods: what about expanding the Village Category range to fit more density designations?

G. Hammers: East of the CWA – 1 du/4 ac to 4.3 du/ac.

J. Grace: West of the CWA – 1 du/ac to 7.3 du/ac.

D. van Dierendonck: cautions that the CWA is not a hard and fast boundary – it is merely an arbitrary line establishing an area, not a line of demarcation. The Urban Limit Line would be, which can now be moved anywhere you want it.

H. Palmer: only 50% of the area within the CWA had water service, and many areas in Twin Oaks are not served by water. And there are no plans by the water authority to provide it.

G. Pryor: group has raised a good point. You don't have to make your service boundaries co-determinous. Sewer, water and roads are the three key ingredients of growth. You can control this with your limit lines.

B. Woods: we should work on the recommendations – having some positive feedback on whether the ranges are wide enough. Are these good categories and do they fit enough of our needs? These categories are draft and do need some massaging?

J. Chisholm: discussing Semi-Rural and Rural: in areas of intensive ag, people want to save the agriculture but wants to preserve ability to subdivide: there is a contradiction. We cannot take away protection, moving to 2 acre lot sizes which do not provide needed housing but could threaten the form of the community.

B. Woods: keep in mind, think regionally but make sure that individually you are represented in the categories.

J. Phillips: these categories will not fit in Valle de Oro. The area is 95% built out. The sentence: "Land use policies would encourage infill development within the Village Limit Line." Should be a heads up for everyone: if it ends up in the general plan the higher densities in the range will be lobbied for by developers using this encouragement in the general plan as justification.

B. Woods: you, Lakeside, and Spring Valley are unique because of they are mostly built out.

J. Phillips: They will not work in a established community. What do you do with our community? Because we are built out, do we get no regional categories? That would be fine but want to retain the Limit Line.

G. Pryor: Not all the characteristics of the categories would apply to all communities. Communities still have the ability to set specific densities to areas of land. Other communities are still in a growth process – this is to encourage them to get that growth within areas that can get services. Look at that as an infill approach. This will not apply to Valle de Oro or Rancho Santa Fe, for example. When we do the EIR for this project, we will be based on those specific densities, any GPA will need an EIR for the magnitude of modification on a much bigger scale. So there are checks in this process.

S. Smith: so these categories are general and we will set the specific designations

G. Pryor: the committees will set the next level down. The Interest Group's role is to work 'big picture' – where should the growth go on a regional scale (the structure map). But to determine specific densities within that structure, that is the primary function of the planning group.

J. Phillips: who draws the Village Limit Line in our community? These definitions would shrink ours, wouldn't make any sense.

G. Pryor: doesn't have to be one line. Could use another boundary. Concerned about using a urban development boundary in communities such as Julian.

Motion to strike language: "Land use policies would encourage infill development within the Village Limit Line." (Lake Morena/Campo) Seconded (Valle de Oro). Passes 16-2.

Motion to amend language within Village Limit Line definition:

"Should be tied to infrastructure service capacities" - replace should with shall. (Lakeside) Seconded (Ramona). Concern that tying Limit Lines to service boundaries would create poorly defined Limit Lines. G. Shackelford amends motion for sentence to read: "shall be tied to the village limit lines." Motion passes unanimously.

D. van Dierendonck: do we as a planning group have the authority to exercise a judgment against the extension of a sewer line?

B. Woods: if you're not working with those districts, you're missing the boat.

G. Pryor: you can go beyond that. In the past, the County has provided poor guidance to districts on future growth patterns. Part of is constantly amending the general plan. We have been working with the water districts, and the districts are agreeing – if we can set a land use pattern – we will provide the service and respect your plan. Since we control land use, those districts who do not agree face putting in an expensive water line with no users.

Break

B. Woods: concern that residential densities are not understood. Ramona village core is different than Jamul's. Range should be large enough to accommodate for community level choices.

L. Jones: Need a preamble to the effect that these categories use ranges and to refer to each community's community plan text for more detail.

J. Phillips: since these are regional categories, at regional level we should look to define types of development, not density ranges.

L. Jones: need to define ranges.

G. Hammers: Ramona is not a village, it is a town. The definitions are topsy-turvy.

B. Woods: village has become a wider term.

G. Hammers: Should be an asterisk: to be determined by planning area. This is a scrimmage between environmentalists and developers, not looking at individual land owners.

M. Morgan: if specific densities are determined in the Community Plan, this is a moot point. Concern that there is still no discussion of agriculture in community plan.

G. Pryor: agriculture must be considered as a land use, not a regional category. Agriculture is a business, not a permitted use or a restricted use. It is not needed as a category as long as it is identified.

G. Shackelford: three recommendations for staff to bring back to meetings in variations.

Motion (Lakeside):

1. density ranges set by individual community plans
2. Village Cores need not be contiguous
3. general plan amendments remain general plan amendments: changes in density must be a change in the General Plan. GPA's need more teeth.
- 4.

Staff asked to look at all comments and bring back to next meeting.

Seconded (Valle de Oro). Motion passes unanimously.

Motion: Amend language in Semi-Rural density range from East of CWA: "Existing development only" to "Consistent with existing development". (Lake Morena/Campo)
Seconded. Passes unanimously.

Motion: Until better defined, eliminate Future Development category. (Valle de Oro) Seconded (Lakeside). Passes unanimously.

Motion: Amend high end of density range in Semi-Rural(West of CWA) from 1 du/4 ac. to 1 du/10 ac. (Twin Oaks) Second (Bonsall). Passes unanimously.

Motion: Amend Rural Land s language, “Includes areas east of CWA that lack infrastructure...” strike out “east of CWA”. (Ramona) Seconded (Lake Morena/Campo) Passes unanimously.

Next Meeting: October 20, 2001

Topics for discussion:

- Commercial Designations
- Industrial Designations